

1 **BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP**  
 2 David Boies (admitted pro hac vice)  
 3 333 Main Street  
 4 Armonk, NY 10504  
 5 Tel.: (914) 749-8200  
 6 dboies@bsflp.com  
 7 Mark C. Mao, CA Bar No. 236165  
 8 Beko Reblitz-Richardson, CA Bar No. 238027  
 9 44 Montgomery St., 41st Floor  
 10 San Francisco, CA 94104  
 11 Tel.: (415) 293-6800  
 12 mmao@bsflp.com  
 13 brichardson@bsflp.com  
 14 James Lee (admitted pro hac vice)  
 15 Rossana Baeza (admitted pro hac vice)  
 16 100 SE 2nd St., 28th Floor  
 17 Miami, FL 33131  
 18 Tel.: (305) 539-8400  
 19 jlee@bsflp.com  
 20 rbaeza@bsflp.com  
 21 Alison L. Anderson, CA Bar No. 275334  
 22 M. Logan Wright, CA Bar No. 349004  
 23 2029 Century Park East, Suite 1520  
 24 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
 25 Tel.: (213) 995-5720  
 26 alanderson@bsflp.com  
 27 mwright@bsflp.com

1 **SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.**  
 2 Bill Carmody (admitted pro hac vice)  
 3 Shawn J. Rabin (admitted pro hac vice)  
 4 Steven M. Shepard (admitted pro hac vice)  
 5 Alexander Frawley (admitted pro hac vice)  
 6 Ryan Sila (admitted pro hac vice)  
 7 One Manhattan West, 50<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 8 New York, NY 10001  
 9 Tel.: (212) 336-8330  
 10 bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com  
 11 srabin@susmangodfrey.com  
 12 sshepard@susmangodfrey.com  
 13 afrawley@susmangodfrey.com  
 14 rsila@susmangodfrey.com  
 15 Amanda K. Bonn, CA Bar No. 270891  
 16 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
 17 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
 18 Tel.: (310) 789-3100  
 19 abonn@susmangodfrey.com

20 **MORGAN & MORGAN**

21 John A. Yanchunis (admitted pro hac vice)  
 22 Ryan J. McGee (admitted pro hac vice)  
 23 Michael F. Ram, CA Bar No. 104805  
 24 201 N. Franklin Street, 7th Floor  
 25 Tampa, FL 33602  
 26 Tel.: (813) 223-5505  
 27 jyanchunis@forthepeople.com  
 28 rmgeee@forthepeople.com  
 29 mram@forthepeople.com

30 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 31 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

32 ANIBAL RODRIGUEZ, SAL  
 33 CATALDO, JULIAN  
 34 SANTIAGO, and SUSAN LYNN  
 35 HARVEY, individually and on behalf of all  
 36 others similarly situated,

37 Plaintiffs,  
 38 vs.  
 39 GOOGLE LLC,  
 40 Defendant.

41 Case No.: 3:20-cv-04688-RS

42 **PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO**  
 43 **GOOGLE'S MOTION IN LIMINE 10**  
 44 **(Dkt. 528)**

45 The Honorable Richard Seeborg  
 46 Courtroom 3 – 17th Floor  
 47 Date: July 30, 2025  
 48 Time: 9:30 a.m.

1       **I. INTRODUCTION**

2       This motion is one where the parties are largely in agreement, and most of Google’s motion  
 3 can and should be denied as moot. Plaintiffs agree with Google (and the Court) that the focus at  
 4 trial should be on Google’s disclosures, not disclosures by third-parties. Plaintiffs do not seek to  
 5 “litigat[e] the adequacy” of “each and every” app privacy policy on an “individualized” basis. Mot.  
 6 at 4-5. Plaintiffs did not even include any app-specific privacy policies on their exhibit list, so there  
 7 is nothing for the Court to exclude. Everyone agrees the outcome of this trial will turn on “*Google’s*  
 8 disclosures about the sWAA button.” Mot. at 3 (emphasis in original). However, Google’s motion  
 9 should be denied in two minor respects where its request for relief goes too far and would give  
 10 Google an unfair advantage.

11      **II. ARGUMENT**

12       **A. Much of Google’s Motion Should Be Denied as Moot.**

13       The concern underlying Google’s motion is unfounded. Google complains that Plaintiffs  
 14 seek to “litigat[e] the adequacy” of “each and every” disclosure “provided by third-party  
 15 applications to class members.” Mot. at 4-5. Put concretely, Google worries that Plaintiffs will  
 16 compare the New York Times privacy policy with the Bank of America privacy policy (and so on  
 17 and so on) thus inviting “individualized inquiries” into any differences among various apps’  
 18 privacy policies. Mot. at 3.

19       Plaintiffs will not do that. Plaintiffs did not even include any app-specific privacy policies  
 20 on their exhibit list, and do not understand how Google came to believe that Plaintiffs would pursue  
 21 this strategy. Indeed, during the meet and confers on trial exhibits, Google’s counsel admitted that  
 22 there are no app-specific privacy policies that refer to the Google privacy controls at issue.  
 23 Plaintiffs are similarly perplexed by Google’s extended discussion of the expert report deadlines,  
 24 and Google’s argument that it is too late for Plaintiffs to serve a new expert report that examines  
 25 differences among various app privacy policies. *See* Mot. at 5. Plaintiffs never suggested they  
 26 would serve such a report, and no such report is forthcoming.

27       Plaintiffs will focus their trial presentation on *Google’s* disclosures to users. And the parties  
 28 agree that “this case is not about the variety of disclosures made by third parties; rather, it ‘concerns

1 *Google's disclosures about the sWAA button.”* Mot. at 3 (quoting Dkt. 352 (class certification  
 2 order) at 17 (emphasis in class certification order)); *see also* Mot. at 4 (“[a]t issue are Google’s  
 3 disclosures around sWAA”). No party should compare one app’s privacy policy with another app’s  
 4 privacy policy and make arguments about the differences, material or otherwise, especially  
 5 because the parties agree that there are no app-specific privacy policies that relate to Google’s  
 6 privacy controls. Google’s motion should be denied as moot.

7 **B. Limited Portions of Google’s Motion Should Be Denied on the Merits.**

8 Google’s motion should be denied on the merits in two limited respects.

9 *First*, after arguing the parties should focus on Google’s disclosures, Google goes on to  
 10 focus on third-party disclosures, asserting that Plaintiffs “should not be allowed *to dispute the*  
 11 *adequacy of those disclosures.*” Mot. at 5 (emphasis added). While not entirely clear, Google  
 12 apparently wants to tell the jury that every third-party disclosure is somehow “adequate,” with  
 13 Plaintiffs unable to respond.

14 Google’s request goes too far, and it would give Google an unfair advantage while also  
 15 misleading the jury. Google has argued that users consented to the challenged conduct insofar as  
 16 users agreed to app-specific privacy policies<sup>1</sup>—an argument this Court rejected at the pleadings  
 17 stage.<sup>2</sup> If the Court were to permit Google to raise these arguments based on third-party disclosures  
 18 at trial, Plaintiffs should be allowed to respond, and Plaintiffs can readily do so without litigating  
 19 the adequacy of every app’s privacy policy on any “individualized” basis. Mot. at 3.

20 If this becomes an issue at trial, in addition to relying on Google’s disclosures to users,  
 21 Plaintiffs will point out that Google during the class period never required third-party apps to  
 22 “explicitly notify” users about the “particular conduct” at issue—Google’s collection and use of

23  
 24 <sup>1</sup> *See, e.g.*, Dkt. 62 (Google’s MTD) at 8-9 (Google arguing that users consented because “Google  
 required [] app developers—as a condition of using GA for Firebase—to obtain consent from their  
 users,” and that “the app developers obtained the required consent”); Mot. at 3 (“apps must disclose  
 and obtain consent from their end users in order to use the SDK”).

25  
 26 <sup>2</sup> *See* Dkt. 109 (MTD Order) at 7-8 (noting that “Plaintiffs do not deny [] reading and agreeing to  
 a develop-generated disclosure,” but crediting Plaintiffs’ allegation that they “interpreted the  
 WAA feature as superseding those app-specific disclosures,” and rejecting Google’s argument that  
 Plaintiffs consented to the challenged conduct).

1 (s)WAA-off data. *Calhoun v. Google, LLC*, 113 F.4th 1141, 1147 (9th Cir. 2024); *see also* Dkt.  
 2 445 (MSJ Order) at 14-15 (“consent is only effective if directed to the particular conduct, or to  
 3 substantially the same conduct”). Plaintiffs will also highlight how Google has *never* identified  
 4 any third-party disclosure that mentions “(s)WAA,” much less discloses that Google fails to honor  
 5 the privacy control Google presented to Plaintiffs and class members. “To the extent Google had  
 6 a policy that required third party apps to disclose Google’s policies to users, that evidence may be  
 7 applied across the class.” Dkt. 352 (class certification order) at 17-18. Plaintiffs will argue that  
 8 Google’s policy was at all times deficient, because Google never required *any* third-party apps to  
 9 disclose the “specific practice” challenged in this case—that Google will collect, save, and use app  
 10 activity data regardless of whether (s)WAA is turned “on” or “off.” *Campbell v. Facebook Inc.*,  
 11 77 F. Supp. 3d 836, 848 (N.D. Cal. 2014). There is nothing individualized about those facts, as  
 12 evidenced by the fact that no third-party apps even talk about Google privacy controls.

13 *Second*, Google claims that to “to the extent” third-party apps are mentioned at trial, any  
 14 discussion should be “limited” to arguing that app developers “must comply” with the Google  
 15 Analytics Terms of Service. Mot. at 5. This argument implies that Google aggressively monitors  
 16 and enforces app developers’ compliance with Google’s terms. There is no evidence to support  
 17 that assertion either, as Google concedes. *See* Mot. at 5 (admitting that Google did not “proffer[]  
 18 a class-wide expert report or other evidence to demonstrate compliance”). If Google nevertheless  
 19 makes this argument, Plaintiffs should of course be allowed to respond and point out that Google  
 20 does not uniformly enforce the policy, to provide relevant context for the jury. However, the better  
 21 path is for Google to simply explain its policy without implying that every app complies with the  
 22 policy.

23 **III. CONCLUSION**

24 For these reasons, the Court should deny Google’s motion *in limine* 10.

25 Dated: July 10, 2025

26 Respectfully submitted,

27 By: s/ Mark Mao

28 Mark C. Mao (CA Bar No. 236165)  
 mmao@bsfllp.com

1 Beko Reblitz-Richardson (CA Bar No. 238027)  
 2 brichardson@bsflp.com  
 3 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
 4 44 Montgomery Street, 41<sup>st</sup> Floor  
 5 San Francisco, CA 94104  
 6 Telephone: (415) 293 6858  
 7 Facsimile (415) 999 9695

8  
 9 David Boies (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 10 dboies@bsflp.com  
 11 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
 12 333 Main Street  
 13 Armonk, NY 10504  
 14 Telephone: (914) 749-8200

15  
 16 James Lee (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 17 jlee@bsflp.com  
 18 Rossana Baeza (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
 19 rbaeza@bsflp.com  
 20 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
 21 100 SE 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Suite 2800  
 22 Miami, FL 33131  
 23 Telephone: (305) 539-8400  
 24 Facsimile: (305) 539-1307

25  
 26 Alison L. Anderson, CA Bar No. 275334  
 27 alanderson@bsflp.com  
 28 M. Logan Wright, CA Bar No. 349004  
 29 mwright@bsflp.com  
 30 BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP  
 31 2029 Century Park East, Suite 1520  
 32 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
 33 Telephone: (813) 482-4814

34  
 35 Bill Carmody (*pro hac vice*)  
 36 bcarmody@susmangodfrey.com  
 37 Shawn J. Rabin (*pro hac vice*)  
 38 srabin@susmangodfrey.com  
 39 Steven Shepard (*pro hac vice*)  
 40 sshepard@susmangodfrey.com  
 41 Alexander P. Frawley  
 42 afrawley@susmangodfrey.com  
 43 Ryan Sila  
 44 rsila@susmangodfrey.com  
 45 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
 46 One Manhattan West, 50<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 47 New York, NY 10001  
 48 Telephone: (212) 336-8330

1 Amanda Bonn (CA Bar No. 270891)  
2 abonn@susmangodfrey.com  
3 SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.  
4 1900 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400  
5 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
6 Telephone: (310) 789-3100

7 John A. Yanchunis (*pro hac vice*)  
8 jyanchunis@forthepeople.com  
9 Ryan J. McGee (*pro hac vice*)  
10 rmcgee@forthepeople.com  
11 Michael F. Ram (CA Bar No. 238027)  
12 mram@forthepeople.com  
13 MORGAN & MORGAN, P.A.  
14 201 N Franklin Street, 7th Floor  
15 Tampa, FL 33602  
16 Telephone: (813) 223-5505  
17 Facsimile: (813) 222-4736

18 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28